



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT  
**NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**  
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT BRANCH  
Washington, D.C. 20570

Via email

October 21, 2021

Re: FOIA Request NLRB-2022-000072

Dear Cody Burns:

This is in response to your request, under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, received on October 14, 2021, in which you seek records relating to *Skylabs, LLC*, Case No. 07-CA-281800.

We acknowledged your request on October 14, 2021

Your request is granted in part and denied in part, as explained below.

A search of the Agency's electronic casehandling system, NxGen, has been conducted. This search has yielded 28 pages of responsive, releasable records from the requested case file, which are attached.

After a review, I have determined that portions of the attached records are exempt from disclosure under Exemptions 6 and 7(C) of the FOIA (5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)). Specifically, redactions have been made to the records to protect the privacy interests of individuals named in the records. These redactions were made pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6, which pertains to information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and FOIA Exemption 7(C), which pertains to records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, the release of which could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6), (b)(7)(C).

Your request is denied to the extent that other responsive records yielded from the search are being withheld in their entirety pursuant to FOIA Exemption 5, 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(5). Specifically, six pages of records are being withheld pursuant to Exemption 5, including a casehandling log, additional notes by the Board agent on case processing, internal communications, and a recommendation memoranda.

Exemption 5 allows agencies to withhold "inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other

than an agency in litigation with the agency,” and covers records that would “normally be privileged in the civil discovery context.” *NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. 132, 149 (1975); *Tax Analysts v. IRS*, 117 F.3d 607, 616 (D.C. Cir. 1997). The deliberative process and the attorney work-product privileges are two of the primary privileges incorporated into Exemption 5.

The deliberative process privilege protects the internal decision-making processes of government agencies to safeguard the quality of agency decisions. *Competitive Enter. Inst. v. OSTP*, 161 F. Supp.3d 120, 128 (D.D.C. 2016). The basis for this privilege is to protect and encourage the creative debate and candid discussion of alternatives. *Jordan v. U.S. Dep’t. of Justice*, 591 F.2d 753, 772 (D.C. Cir.1978). Two fundamental requirements must be satisfied before an agency may properly withhold a record pursuant to the deliberative process privilege. First, the record must be predecisional, *i.e.*, prepared in order to assist an agency decision-maker in arriving at the decision. *Renegotiation Bd. v. Grumman Aircraft Eng’g Corp.*, 421 U.S. 168, 184 (1975); *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FDA*, 449 F.3d 141, 151 (D.C. Cir. 2006). Second, the record must be deliberative, *i.e.*, “it must form a part of the agency’s deliberative process in that it makes recommendations or expresses opinions on legal or policy matters.” *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FDA*, 449 F.3d at 151 (quoting *Coastal States Gas Corp. v. U.S. Dep’t of Energy*, 617 F.2d 854, 866 (D.C. Cir. 1980)). To satisfy these requirements, the agency need not “identify a specific decision in connection with which a memorandum is prepared. Agencies are . . . engaged in a continuing process of examining their policies; this process will generate memoranda containing recommendations which do not ripen into agency decisions; and the lower courts should be wary of interfering with this process.” *Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. at 151 n.18 (1975). Moreover, the protected status of a predecisional record is not altered by the subsequent issuance of a decision, *see, e.g., Fed. Open Mkt. Comm. v. Merrill*, 443 U.S. 340, 360 (1979); *Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. DHS*, 384 F. Supp. 2d 100, 112-13 (D.D.C. 2005) or by the agency opting not to make a decision. *See Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Clinton*, 880 F. Supp. 1, 13 (D.D.C. 1995), *aff’d*, 76 F.3d 1232 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (citing *Russell v. U.S. Dep’t of the Air Force*, 682 F.2d 1045 (D.C. Cir. 1982)).

The attorney work-product privilege protects records and other memoranda that reveal an attorney’s mental impressions and legal theories that were prepared by an attorney, or a non-attorney supervised by an attorney, in contemplation of litigation. *See United States v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 239 n.13 (1975); *Hickman v. Taylor*, 329 U.S. 495, 509-10 (1947). Additionally, the protection provided by Exemption 5 for attorney work-product records is not subject to defeat even if a requester could show a substantial need for the information and undue hardship in obtaining it from another source. *See FTC v. Grolier, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 19, 28 (1983). Further, protection against the disclosure of work product records extends even after litigation is terminated. *Id.* The attorney work-product privilege extends to records prepared in anticipation of both pending litigation and

foreseeable litigation and even when no specific claim is contemplated at the time the attorney prepared the material. *Schiller v. NLRB*, 964 F.2d 1205, 1208 (D.C. Cir. 1992). Furthermore, the privilege protects any part of a record prepared in anticipation of litigation, not just the portions concerning opinions and legal theories, see *Judicial Watch v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 432 F.3d 366, 371 (D.C. Cir. 2005), and is intended to protect an attorney's opinions, thoughts, impressions, interpretations, analyses and strategies. *Id.*; see also *Wolfson v. United States*, 672 F. Supp.2d 20, 29 (D.D.C. 2009). See *Judicial Watch*, 432 F.3d at 371 (finding that an agency need not segregate and disclose non-exempt material if a record is fully protected as work product).

Here, the responsive records being withheld meet the requirements for Exemption 5 protection under both the deliberative process and attorney work-product privileges. They are internal and predecisional. They reflect the views of the General Counsel and her Regional staff concerning prosecutorial policies and strategies in the processing of this unfair labor practice case. Since they analyze various legal theories and strategies, these internal casehandling records clearly reflect the deliberative and consultative process of the Agency that Exemption 5 protects from forced disclosure. *Sears, Roebuck and Co.*, 421 U.S. at 150-52. Additionally, the content of the records is also attorney work-product, as it reflects legal analysis and opinions of the General Counsel's staff created to assist superiors in their decision-making process, in anticipation of possible litigation. Accordingly, the records are being withheld in their entirety.

For the purpose of assessing fees, we have placed you in Category D, the "all other requesters" category, because you do not fall within any of the other fee categories. Consistent with this fee category, you will be assessed charges to recover the reasonable direct costs for searching for the requested records, except that you will not be charged for the first two hours of search. NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(d)(2)(ii)(D). Charges for all categories of requesters are \$9.25 per quarter hour of professional time. 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(d)(2)(i).

Less than two hours of professional time was expended in searching for the requested material. Accordingly, there is no charge assessed for this request.

You may contact Marissa Wagner, the FOIA Attorney-Advisor who processed your request, at (202) 273-2957 or by email at [marissa.wagner@nrlb.gov](mailto:marissa.wagner@nrlb.gov), as well as the Agency's FOIA Public Liaison, for any further assistance and/or to discuss any aspect of your request. The FOIA Public Liaison, in addition to the FOIA Attorney, can further explain responsive and releasable agency records, suggest agency offices that may have responsive records, and/or discuss how to narrow the scope of a request in order to minimize fees and processing times. The contact information for the FOIA Public Liaison is:

FOIA Public Liaison  
National Labor Relations Board  
1015 Half Street, S.E., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
Email: FOIAPublicLiaison@nrlrb.gov  
Telephone: (202) 273-0902  
Fax: (202) 273-FOIA (3642)

After first contacting the Agency, you may additionally contact the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA dispute resolution services it offers. The contact information for OGIS is:

Office of Government Information Services  
National Archives and Records Administration  
8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS  
College Park, Maryland 20740-6001  
Email: ogis@nara.gov  
Telephone: (202) 741-5770  
Toll free: (877) 684-6448  
Fax: (202) 741-5769

You may obtain a review of this determination under the NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(c)(2)(v), by filing an administrative appeal with the Division of Legal Counsel (DLC) through FOIAonline at:  
<https://foiaonline.gov/foiaonline/action/public/home> or by mail or email at:

Nancy E. Kessler Platt  
Chief FOIA Officer  
National Labor Relations Board  
1015 Half Street, S.E., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20570  
Email: DLCFOIAAppeal@nrlrb.gov

Any appeal must be postmarked or electronically submitted within 90 days of the date of this letter, such period beginning to run on the calendar day after the date of this letter. Any appeal should contain a complete statement of the reasons upon which it is based.

Please be advised that contacting any Agency official (including the FOIA Attorney-Advisor, FOIA Officer, or the FOIA Public Liaison) and/or

October 21, 2021

Page 5

OGIS does not stop the 90-day appeal clock and is not an alternative or substitute for filing an administrative appeal.

Sincerely,

/s/ *Synta E Keeling*

Synta E. Keeling  
FOIA Officer

Attachment: (28 pages)